

Remarks

The Office Action of March 10, 2006, presented a Restriction Requirement. In support of the restriction, two inventions were identified: claims 1-8 were cited as Group I and classified in class 337, subclass 206 and claim 9 was cited as Group II and classified in class 361, subclass 642. Applicant hereby elects claims 1-8 identified as Group I. However, Applicant respectfully traverses the asserted Restriction Requirement for the following reasons and requests rejoinder of the claims.

The Office Action stated that “the combination as claimed does not require the particular of the subcombination as claimed at least in part because Group II does not provide a second support, a circuit element and a label.” To this end, the Office Action stated that the proffered restriction was proper because “the search required for Group I is not required for Group II.” Applicant respectfully disagrees with these conclusions because: (1) the Office Action failed to show that broadest claims of Groups I and II are sufficiently different in scope and, as a result, (2) the Office Action did not establish that a search of the claims of Group I would not include the subject matter called for in the claims of Group II.

In particular, the cited elements (i.e. a second support, a circuit element and a label) in the Office Action as providing a basis for finding the claims of Group I to be separate and distinct from those of Group II are **only** included in the dependent claims. That is, the cited elements of “a second support”, “a circuit element”, and “a label” are called for in claims 3 through 5, which depend from claim 1. Hence, contrary to the position asserted in the Office Action, a search of claim 1 would not include the subject matter that the Office Action identified as lacking from Group II. Therefore, Applicant does not believe that a proper basis has been established to support the statement that “the search required for Group I is not required for Group II,” as the Office Action stated.

To further illustrate such, new claims 11 and 12 have been added that depend from claim 9 and include the subject matter identified to support the proffered restriction. That is, claim 11 depends from claim 9 and calls for the cited “second support” and “circuit element”, whereas claim 12 also depends from claim 9 and calls for the cited “label”. Accordingly, the basis for finding that Groups I and II were not coextensive has been eliminated.

Additionally, Applicant has added new claim 10 that is dependant upon claim 1 and further clarifies that the claimed fuse status indicator is configured to be arranged within a fuse cartridge assembly including a casing having an opening in which contacts to fuse clips are exposed. This additional claim further illustrates the coextensive scope of the identified Groups.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Office Action has not presented a proper basis for restriction. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the claims be rejoined prior to substantive examination on the merits.

As always, the Examiner is invited to call the Undersigned at the number appearing below if such would help advance the prosecution of the application. Though no fees are believed due, should any fees be due as a result of this or any other communication, authorization is given to charge Quarles & Brady Deposit Account No. 17-0055.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Jack M. Cook
Registration No. 56,098
Quarles and Brady LLP
411 East Wisconsin Ave.
Milwaukee, WI 53202
(414) 277-5405